

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Application of:

Lester et al.

Application No.: 10/021,752

Filed: October 29, 2001

For: Interactive Delivery of Media  
Using Dynamic Playlist  
Generation Subject to Restrictive  
Criteria

Group Art Unit: 2154

Confirmation No. 6272

Examiner: M. Siddiqi

APPELLANTS' BRIEF

TO THE COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS:

This communication is submitted in response to the Final Office Action dated April 6, 2006 and the Notice of Appeal filed on October 6, 2006 pertaining to the captioned patent application identified above. Appellants, Lester et al., have previously filed a Notice of Appeal from the action of the Examiner in finally rejecting all of the claims that were considered in this application. This Brief is being filed under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.192. The Filing Fee corresponding to this Appeal Brief, as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(c), is transmitted herewith.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST.....	4
II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES.....	4
III. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS.....	4
IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS.....	4
V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER.....	4
VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL.....	6
VII. GROUPING OF CLAIMS .....	7
VIII. ARGUMENT.....	8

A.	ISSUE 1.....	8
B.	ISSUE 2.....	13
C.	ISSUE 3.....	15
D.	ISSUE 4.....	19
IX.	SUMMARY.....	22
X.	CLAIMS APPENDIX A .....	23
XI.	EVIDENCE APPENDIX.....	27
XII.	RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX .....	28

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### **FEDERAL CASES**

*In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 44 USPQ2d 1429 (Fed. Cir. 1997)

*In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 1534, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993)

*In re Oelrich*, 666 F.2d 578, 581-82, 212 USPQ 323, 326 (CCPA 1981)

### **FEDERAL STATUTES**

35 U.S.C. §102(e)

### **MPEP**

MPEP § 2112

## I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The rights of the inventors in this application have been assigned to RealNetworks, Inc. of Seattle, Washington by way of assignment from James P. Lester, and Alexander J. Kirk ("Lester et al.") who are the named inventors and are captioned in the present brief.

## II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellants, Appellants' legal representative, and the above-identified assignee are unaware of other appeals or interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the present appeal.

## III. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-11 and 26-32 are pending. Appellants appeal the rejection of each of these claims.

## IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

As requested by the Examiner, a full set of claims as currently entered is attached in Appendix A. These claims include amendments from previously entered amendments requested in filed Office Action responses. These claims represent the latest true and correct version of the claims.

## V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

### A. Claim 1 (and related claims 3-5 and 9-11)

Regarding this independent claim, as currently pending claim 1 recites:

A computer implemented method of delivering digital media items to one or more user electronic devices, the method comprising:

delivering to one or more of the user electronic devices, via a computer network, the digital media items in a sequential order from a playlist, the playlist indicating a plurality of the digital media items to be delivered and the sequential order for their delivery to one or more of the user electronic devices;

receiving one or more requests for at least one digital media item from one or more of the user electronic devices; and

selectively adding an indication of the requested digital media item to the playlist on at least one of the user electronic devices if the modified playlist would satisfy a set of restrictive criteria.

Thus, under pending claim 1 (and dependent claims 3-5 and 9-11), the method recited is directed toward delivering digital media items, *i.e.*, song files, to one or more user electronic devices such that the delivery is done so based on a playlist. The playlist may be interactively modified by users based on both the users' requests subject to a set of restrictive criteria, such as the criteria relating to the Digital Millennium Copyright Act. As a result, actual digital media items requested by actual users may be added to a playlist so long as compliance with the restrictions of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act is maintained.

B. Claim 2 and 6-8

Claims 2 and 6-8 depend directly from claim 1 and consequently include all of the recitations discussed above regarding claim 1. These claims include additional recitations regarding the set of restrictive criteria by which digital media file requests are subjected to when added to the playlist. Such additional recitations include group preferences, statutory licensing, and time restrictions.

C. Claim 26 (and related claims 29-32)

Regarding this independent claim, as currently pending claim 26 recites:

One or more media servers for delivering digital media files to a plurality of client electronic devices over a computer network, the one or more media servers comprising:  
a network connection for communicatively coupling one or more of the media servers with the plurality of client electronic devices over the network;  
a playlist memory containing a playlist, wherein the playlist indicates a sequential order to render a set of the digital media files;  
a media storage memory containing a library of the digital media files; and

a processor coupled with the network connection, the playlist memory, and the media storage memory, the processor operative to:

evaluate requests for digital media files from one or more of the client electronic devices using a set of restrictive criteria;

upon at least one of the requests satisfying the set of restrictive criteria, add an indication of the requested digital media file to the playlist; and

transmit digital media files according to the sequential order indicated by the playlist from the media storage memory to the plurality of client electronic devices over the computer network.

Thus, under pending claim 26 (and dependent claims 29-32), the system recited is directed toward a network of devices capable of delivering digital media items, *i.e.*, song files, to one or more user electronic devices such that the delivery is done so based on a playlist. The playlist may be interactively modified by users based on the users' requests subject to a set of restrictive criteria, such as the criteria relating to the Digital Millennium Copyright Act. As a result, actual digital media items requested by actual users may be added to a playlist so long as compliance with the restrictions of the Digital Millennium Copyright Act is maintained.

#### D. Claim 27 and 28

Claims 27 and 28 depend directly from claim 26 and consequently include all of the recitations discussed above regarding claim 26. These claims include additional recitations regarding the set of restrictive criteria by which digital media file requests may be added to the playlist. Such additional recitations include group preferences, statutory licensing, and time restrictions.

## VI. GROUND'S OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Thus, the issues in the appeal are as follows:

1. Whether U.S. Patent Application 2002/0082901 A1 to Dunning et al. (“Dunning”) teaches all of the features and recitations as respectively recited by claims 1, 3-5, and 9-11.

2. Whether U.S. Patent Application 2002/0082901 A1 to Dunning et al. teaches all of the features and recitations as respectively recited by claims 2 and 6-8.

3. Whether U.S. Patent Application 2002/0082901 A1 to Dunning et al. teaches all of the features and recitations as respectively recited by claims 26 and 29-32.

4. Whether U.S. Patent Application 2002/0082901 A1 to Dunning et al. teaches all of the features and recitations as respectively recited by claims 27 and 28.

## VII. GROUPING OF CLAIMS

The Appellant suggests the following grouping of Claims according to the Issues noted above:

I. Issue 1 is directed toward pending claims 1, 3-5, and 9-11 such that these claims stand or fall together with respect to this issue.

II. Issue 2 is directed toward pending claims 2 and 6-8 such that these claims stand or fall together with respect to this issue.

III. Issue 3 is directed toward pending claims 26 and 29-32 such that these claims stand or fall together with respect to this issue.

IV. Issue 4 is directed toward pending claims 27 and 28 such that these claims stand or fall together with respect to this issue.

## VIII. ARGUMENT

**Issue 1: Dunning, whether considered alone or in conjunction with any prior art of record fails to teach all of the recitations as respectively recited by claims 1, 3-5, and 109.**

A1. As to the set of claims corresponding to issue 1, claims 1, 3-5, and 9-11 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1. Thus, claims 3-5 and 9-11 include all of the features and limitations of claim 1, in combination with its own respective features and limitations.

Claims 1, 3-5, and 9-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Dunning. Regarding the independent claim, claim 1 recites:

A computer implemented method of delivering digital media items to one or more user electronic devices, the method comprising:  
delivering to one or more of the user electronic devices, via a computer network, the digital media items in a sequential order from a playlist, the playlist indicating a plurality of the digital media items to be delivered and the sequential order for their delivery to one or more of the user electronic devices;  
receiving one or more requests for at least one digital media item from one or more of the user electronic devices; and  
selectively adding an indication of the requested digital media item to the playlist on at least one of the user electronic devices if the modified playlist would satisfy a set of restrictive criteria.

Thus, under pending claim 1 (and dependent claims 3-5 and 9-11), the method recited is directed toward a novel approach for selectively adding digital media files to a playlist based on a set of restrictive criteria. In specific, the unique approach offers users of electronic devices, such as an Internet-ready radio, the ability to request specific digital media items to be streamed to a user's electronic device while maintaining compliance with restrictive criteria, such as the Digital Millennium Copyright Act. With such a method in place, a user of an electronic device may actively participate in shaping the playlist of a streamed signal received by the user's electronic device. Thus, actual specific user's requests may be added to a streaming playlist if, and only if, the adding of the specific requested digital



media item does not violate one or more restrictive criteria.

Resultantly, an Internet-radio station may actively solicit requests from users of the Internet radio station, *i.e.*, user electronic devices that stream the content provided by the Internet-radio station, and actively include one or more requests in one or more modifications of the playlist such that specifically requested digital media items are added to the playlist so long as the modification of the playlist complies with a set of restrictive criteria. For example, the Digital Millennium Copyright Act specifically allows providers of streaming content to not obtain statutory licenses for the delivery of digital content as long as “fewer than a substantial portion of the programming consists of songs delivered within an hour of the request or at a time specified by the broadcaster.” Therefore, a digital content provider may stream a selection of digital content that includes specifically requested digital media if the specifically requested digital media does not exceed a substantial portion of the overall programming. In but one example, a substantial portion of the programming may be defined as a rate of two requested items per hour.

A2 The most recent Office Action dated April 6, 2006 (“Office Action”) rejected claims 1, 3-5, and 9-11 as being anticipated by Dunning. Regarding these rejections, Appellants respectfully disagree on appeal.

A3. In pertinent part, U.S.C. §102(e) recites:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless: (e) the invention was described in - (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language;

To anticipate a claim, a prior art reference must disclose every limitation of the claimed invention, either expressly or inherently. *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 44 USPQ2d 1429 (Fed. Cir. 1997). The fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of

that result or characteristic. *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 1534, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993)(reversed rejection because inherency was based on what would result due to optimization of conditions, not what was necessarily present in the prior art). See also *In re Oelrich*, 666 F.2d 578, 581-82, 212 USPQ 323, 326 (CCPA 1981) and MPEP §2112.

A4 A rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) requires the Examiner to show that a prior art reference teaches each and every element in an anticipated claim. Independent claim 1 has been previously amended to direct towards a novel method of modifying a playlist of digital media based on recognition of restrictive criteria. As such, the Office Action contends that Dunning teaches:

- A computer implemented method of delivering digital media items to one or more user electronic devices, the method comprising. Page 6 paragraph 91, page 5 paragraph 85, and the abstract of Dunning are referenced.
- Delivering to one or more of the user electronic devices, via a computer network, the digital media items in a sequential order from a playlist, the playlist indicating a plurality of the digital media items to be delivered and the sequential order for their delivery to one or more of the user electronic devices. Page 6 paragraph 91, page 5 paragraph 85, page 17 paragraphs 280-281, page 4 paragraphs 45-46, and page 8 paragraphs 120-121 of Dunning are referenced.
- Receiving one or more requests for at least one digital media item from one or more of the user electronic devices. Page 5 paragraphs 85-86 of Dunning are referenced.
- Selectively adding an indication of the requested digital media item to the playlist on at least one of the user electronic devices if the modified playlist would satisfy a set of restrictive criteria. Pages 7-8 paragraphs 111-113, page 17 paragraphs 280-281, and page 25 paragraphs 255-256 of Dunning are referenced.

Appellants submit that each and every recitation of claim 1 is not disclosed by Dunning as contended by the Office Action. This is discussed further below.

A5. The primary cited and applied reference, Dunning, discloses a relationship discovery engine to recommend items based on discovered relationships. Specifically, Dunning makes recommendations to a user based on a

user profile generated using apparent user preferences in accordance with a binomial log likelihood ratio analysis technique. Dunning further indicates that this technique may be used to automatically generate track lists for a personalized radio station (see *e.g.*, Dunning [0044]-[0049] on page 4). Specific cited sections of Dunning are directed to populating a jukebox with digital media content based upon user-associated data such as past media selections and the like. See page 5, [0085]-[0086] of Dunning. That is, a software module, often called a jukebox, may stream digital media to a number of connected media players, such as a program running on a user's computer.

A6. Dunning does not disclose adding an indication of the requested digital media item to the playlist if the modified playlist would satisfy a set of restrictive criteria as recited in Claim 1. That is, Dunning does not teach providing any kind of mechanism or method for allowing the receiving of requests from a user electronic device that may, in turn, modify a playlist received back at the user electronic device subject to restrictive criteria. Dunning may teach a jukebox having automatically generated track lists but limits delivery of this customized playlist to a single user. Thus, although there may be several listeners connected to a jukebox, each listener is provided separate track lists "to be played by the user" (see *e.g.*, Dunning [0121] on page 8) and generation of the separate track lists is based on determined preferences of that user "to populate .. with music tracks that are likely to appeal to a particular listener," (Dunning [0049] on page 4).

Moreover, there is no indication in Dunning that the actual requested digital media items are delivered to the plurality of user electronic devices as recited in claim 1. The digital media items used to populate a playlist in Dunning is generated from similar digital media, *i.e.*, items that may likely appeal to a user because other similar items have been selected. Rather, Dunning only indicates that the generated track list played on the personalized radio station may be sampled/heard by the primary user whose profile was used to generate the track list (see *e.g.*, "a particular listener" in Dunning [0049] on page 4 and "the user" in Dunning [0121] on page 8).

For example, in the method of claim 1, a user may request the song "Jumping Jack Flash" by the Rolling Stones. If adding this specific song to the playlist is within

restrictive criteria, then this specific song is added to the playlist. Dunning, quite differently, may take note that a user has already played the song “Jumping Jack Flash” by the Rolling Stones and add the song “Jumping Jack Flash” by Aretha Franklin to the playlist because they are similar. Thus, in Dunning, the “requested” item is not the same item added to the playlist and this is a method that is in direct contrast with the method of claim 1.

A7. Dunning does not disclose selectively adding an indication of the requested digital media item to the playlist on at least one of the user electronic devices as recited in claim 1. Further, Dunning does not teach or discuss the prophetic reconfiguration of a previously generated playlist in accordance with “a set of restrictive criteria” as recited in claim 1. Specifically, Dunning does not show projecting the effect of “selectively adding the requested media item to the playlist” with respect to “satisfying a set of restrictive criteria” as recited in claim 1 of the instant application. Thus, populating a programming block with various segments according to Dunning is limited to generating a new track list that is compliant with “heuristic rules for repetition limits and classes of songs” (Dunning [0049] on page 4) to automatically generate brand new track lists, rather than modifying a previously available track list with a proposed/requested “media item” from the user and evaluating whether the modified track list “would satisfy a set of restrictive criteria” as recited in claim 1 of the instant application.

Moreover, Dunning is limited to the automatic generation of track lists based on user profiles that are generated “without requiring users to complete questionnaires” (Dunning Abstract). In fact, in this respect the passive automatic track list generation of Dunning without active user input actually teaches away from the instant invention, where a playlist is constructed by “receiving a request for a media item from one or more of the users” and “selectively adding the requested media item to the play list” so long as the modified playlist would still satisfy “a set of restrictive criteria” as recited in claim 1 of the instant application. Ideally, in the personalized radio station operating in accordance with Dunning, the Dunning user does not need to (much less, is even allowed to) make any requests because the track lists are automatically generated.

A8. Dunning does not disclose receiving one or more requests for at least one digital media item from one or more of the user electronic devices as recited in claim 1. Clearly, Dunning does not show delivering to the user electronic devices digital media items as recited in claim 1 of the instant application. Nor does Dunning anticipate receiving one or more requests for at least one digital media item from one or more of the user electronic devices and selectively adding the requested digital media item as recited in Claim 1.

A9. In view of the foregoing, the Appellants respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 1, 3-5, and 9-11 must fail for impropriety, and that Board must accordingly overturn these rejections.

**Issue 2: Dunning, whether considered alone or in conjunction with any other prior art of record, fails to teach all of the recitations as respectively recited by claims 2 and 6-8.**

B1. As to the set of claims corresponding to issue 2, claims 2 and 6-8 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1. Thus, claims 2 and 6-8 include all of the features and limitations of claim 1, in combination with its own respective features and limitations.

Claims 2 and 6-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Dunning with respect independent claim 1. Claim 1 is directed to a novel method for modifying a digital media playlist while maintaining compliance with a set of restrictive criteria. Regarding these rejections, Appellants respectfully disagree on appeal.

B2. To anticipate a claim, a prior art reference must disclose every limitation of the claimed invention, either expressly or inherently. *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 44 USPQ2d 1429 (Fed. Cir. 1997). The fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic. *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 1534, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993)(reversed rejection because inherency was based on what would result due to optimization of conditions, not what was

necessarily present in the prior art). See also *In re Oelrich*, 666 F.2d 578, 581-82, 212 USPQ 323, 326 (CCPA 1981) and MPEP §2112.

B3 A rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) requires the Examiner to show that a prior art reference teaches each and every element in an anticipated claim. Independent claim 1 has been previously amended to direct towards a novel method of the playlist based on recognition of restrictive criteria. Claims 2 and 6-8 recite additional patentable subject matter regarding the nature of the restrictive criteria. For example, claim 2 further recites the restrictive criteria comprises compliance with a set of group criteria. As another example, claim 6 recites additional restrictive criteria wherein delivering digital media items comprises broadcasting media items to one or more of the user electronic devices so that fewer than a substantial number of media items are delivered within an hour of when their corresponding request was received.

B4. The primary cited and applied reference, Dunning, discloses only a passing mention of generating new playlists (which is not the same as modifying existing playlists) within limiting legislation so as to comply with the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (see page 4, [0049]), but makes absolutely no further mention of any restrictive criteria, much less restrictions that may affect/modify an existing playlist. Certainly, Dunning does not rise to the level of disclosing such criteria as compliance with a set of group criteria or limiting broadcast of digital media so as that fewer than a substantial number of media items are delivered within an hour of when their corresponding request was received. In fact, Dunning provides no link between any requested media items and a subjugation to any restrictive criteria. Dunning simply does not address the nature of dealing with digital media requests and actual adding the requested digital media to a playlist. At best, Dunning discloses adding one or more digital media items to populate a newly generated playlist based upon past user choices or user preferences and specifically not based on any current request from a user.

B5. In view of the foregoing, the Appellants respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 2 and 6-8 must fail for impropriety, and that Board must accordingly overturn these rejections.

**Issue 3: Dunning, whether considered alone or in conjunction with any other prior art of record, fails to teach all of the recitations as respectively recited by claims 26 and 29-32.**

C1. As to the set of claims corresponding to issue 3, claims 26 and 29-32 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 26. Thus, claims 26 and 29-32 include all of the features and limitations of claim 26, in combination with its own respective features and limitations.

Claims 26 and 29-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(e) as being anticipated by Dunning. Regarding the independent claim, claim 26 recites:

One or more media servers for delivering digital media files to a plurality of client electronic devices over a computer network, the one or more media servers comprising:

- a network connection for communicatively coupling one or more of the media servers with the plurality of client electronic devices over the network;
- a playlist memory containing a playlist, wherein the playlist indicates a sequential order to render a set of the digital media files;
- a media storage memory containing a library of the digital media files; and
- a processor coupled with the network connection, the playlist memory, and the media storage memory, the processor operative to:
  - evaluate requests for digital media files from one or more of the client electronic devices using a set of restrictive criteria;
  - upon at least one of the requests satisfying the set of restrictive criteria, add an indication of the requested digital media file to the playlist; and
  - transmit digital media files according to the sequential order indicated by the playlist from the media storage memory to the plurality of client electronic devices over the computer network.

Thus, under pending claim 26 (and dependent claims 29-32), the system recited is directed toward a novel system for modifying a digital media play list based on user requests while still complying with a set of restrictive criteria. As an example, an Internet-radio station may actively solicit requests from users of the Internet radio station, *i.e.*, user electronic devices that stream the content provided by the Internet-radio station, and actively include one or more requests in one or

more modifications of the playlist such that specifically requested digital media items are added to the playlist so long as the modification of the playlist complies with a set of restrictive criteria. For example, the Digital Millennium Copyright Act specifically allows providers of streaming content to not obtain statutory licenses for the delivery of digital content as long as “fewer than a substantial portion of the programming consists of songs delivered within an hour of the request or at a time specified by the broadcaster.” Therefore, a digital content provider may stream a selection of digital content that includes specifically requested digital media if the specifically requested digital media does not exceed a substantial portion of the overall programming. In but one example, a substantial portion of the programming may be defined as a rate of two requested items per hour.

C2. The most recent Office Action rejected claims 26 and 29-32 as being anticipated by Dunning. Regarding these rejections, Appellants respectfully disagree on appeal.

C3. To anticipate a claim, a prior art reference must disclose every limitation of the claimed invention, either expressly or inherently. *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 44 USPQ2d 1429 (Fed. Cir. 1997). The fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic. *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 1534, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993)(reversed rejection because inherency was based on what would result due to optimization of conditions, not what was necessarily present in the prior art). See also *In re Oelrich*, 666 F.2d 578, 581-82, 212 USPQ 323, 326 (CCPA 1981) and MPEP §2112.

C4. A rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) requires the Examiner to show that a prior art reference teaches each and every element in an anticipated claim. Independent claim 26 has been previously amended to direct towards a novel method of modifying a playlist of digital media based on recognition of restrictive criteria. As such, the Office Action contends that Dunning teaches:

- One or more media servers for delivering digital media files to a plurality of client electronic devices over a computer network,



the one or more media servers comprising. Page 6 paragraph 91 and page 5 paragraph 85 of Dunning are referenced.

- A network connection for communicatively coupling one or more of the media servers with the plurality of client electronic devices over the network. Page 6 paragraph 91 and page 5 paragraph 85 of Dunning are referenced.
- A playlist memory containing a playlist, wherein the playlist indicates a sequential order to render a set of the digital media files. Page 4 paragraphs 45-46 and page 17 paragraphs 280-281 of Dunning are referenced.
- A media storage memory containing a library of the digital media files. Page 4 paragraphs 45-46 and page 17 paragraphs 280-281 of Dunning are referenced.
- A processor coupled with the network connection, the playlist memory, and the media storage memory, the processor operative to evaluate requests for digital media files from one or more of the client electronic devices using a set of restrictive criteria, upon at least one of the requests satisfying the set of restrictive criteria, add an indication of the requested digital media file to the playlist, and transmit digital media files according to the sequential order indicated by the playlist from the media storage memory to the plurality of client electronic devices over the computer network. Page 25 paragraphs 255-25, page 20, paragraph 304, and pages 5-6 paragraphs 85-86 of Dunning are referenced.

Appellants submit that each and every recitation of claim 26 is not disclosed by Dunning as contended by the Office Action. This is discussed further below.

C5. The primary cited and applied reference, Dunning, discloses a relationship discovery engine to recommend items based on discovered relationships. Specifically, Dunning makes recommendations to a user based on a user profile generated using apparent user preferences in accordance with a binomial log likelihood ratio analysis technique. Dunning further indicates that this technique may be used to automatically generate track lists for a personalized radio station (see *e.g.*, Dunning [0044]-[0049] on page 4). Specific cited sections of Dunning are directed to populating a jukebox with digital media content based upon user-associated data such as past media selections and the like. See page 5, [0085]-[0086] of Dunning. That is, a software module, often called a jukebox, may

stream digital media to a number of connected media players, such as a program running on a user's computer.

C6. Dunning does not disclose a processor that is operative to evaluate requests for digital media files from one or more of the client electronic devices using a set of restrictive criteria. Dunning does not teach providing any kind of mechanism or method for allowing the receiving of requests from a user electronic device that may, in turn, modify a playlist received back at the user electronic device subject to restrictive criteria. Dunning may teach a jukebox having automatically generated track lists but limits delivery of this customized playlist to a single user. Thus, although there may be several listeners connected to a jukebox, each listener is provided separate track lists "to be played by the user" (see *e.g.*, Dunning [0121] on page 8) and generation of the separate track lists is based on determined preferences of that user "to populate ... with music tracks that are likely to appeal to a particular listener," (Dunning [0049] on page 4).

Moreover, there is no indication in Dunning that the actual requested digital media items is delivered to the plurality of client electronic devices as recited in claim 26. The digital media items used to populate a playlist in Dunning are generated from similar digital media, *i.e.*, items that may likely appeal to a user because other similar items have been selected. Dunning only indicates that the generated track list played on the personalized radio station may be sampled/heard by the primary user whose profile was used to generate the track list (see *e.g.*, "a particular listener" in Dunning [0049] on page 4 and "the user" in Dunning [0121] on page 8).

For example, in the system of claim 26, a user may request the song "Jumping Jack Flash" by the Rolling Stones. If adding this specific song to the playlist is within restrictive criteria, then this specific song is added to the playlist. Dunning, quite differently, may take note that a user has already played the song "Jumping Jack Flash" by the Rolling Stones and add the song "Jumping Jack Flash" by Aretha Franklin to the playlist because they are similar. Thus, in Dunning, the "requested" item is not the same item added to the playlist and this is a method that is in direct contrast with the system of claim 26.

C7. Dunning does not disclose a processor that may, upon at least one of the requests satisfying the set of restrictive criteria, add an indication of the requested digital media file to the playlist as recited in claim 26. Further, Dunning does not teach or discuss the prophetic reconfiguration of a previously generated playlist in accordance with “a set of restrictive criteria” as recited in claim 26. Specifically, Dunning does not show projecting the effect of “selectively adding the requested media item to the playlist” with respect to “satisfying a set of restrictive criteria.” Thus, populating a programming block with various segments according to Dunning is limited to generating a new track list that is compliant with “heuristic rules for repetition limits and classes of songs” (Dunning [0049] on page 4) to automatically generate brand new track lists, rather than modifying a previously available track list with a proposed/requested “media item” from the user and evaluating whether the modified track list “would satisfy a set of restrictive criteria.”

Moreover, Dunning is limited to the automatic generation of track lists based on user profiles that are generated “without requiring users to complete questionnaires” (Dunning Abstract). In fact, in this respect the passive automatic track list generation of Dunning without active user input actually teaches away from the instant invention, where a playlist is constructed by “receiving a request for a media item from one or more of the users” and “selectively adding the requested media item to the play list” so long as the modified playlist would still satisfy “a set of restrictive criteria” as recited in claim 26 of the instant application. Ideally, in the personalized radio station operating in accordance with Dunning, the Dunning user does not need to (much less, even allowed to) make any requests because the track lists are automatically generated.

C8. In view of the foregoing, the Appellants respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 26 and 29-32 must fail for impropriety, and that Board must accordingly overturn these rejections.

**Issue 4: Dunning, whether considered alone or in conjunction with any other prior art of record, fails to teach all of the recitations as respectively recited by claims 27-28.**

D1. As to the set of claims corresponding to issue 4, claims 27-28 depend directly from independent claim 26. Thus, claims 27-28 include all of the features and limitations of claim 26, in combination with its own respective features and limitations.

Claims 27-28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Dunning. Claim 26 is directed to a novel system for modifying a digital media play list based on user requests while still complying with a set of restrictive criteria. Regarding these rejections, Appellants respectfully disagree on appeal.

D2. To anticipate a claim, a prior art reference must disclose every limitation of the claimed invention, either expressly or inherently. *In re Schreiber*, 128 F.3d 1473, 44 USPQ2d 1429 (Fed. Cir. 1997). The fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic. *In re Rijckaert*, 9 F.3d 1531, 1534, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993)(reversed rejection because inherency was based on what would result due to optimization of conditions, not what was necessarily present in the prior art). See also *In re Oelrich*, 666 F.2d 578, 581-82, 212 USPQ 323, 326 (CCPA 1981) and MPEP §2112.

D3 A rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) requires the Examiner to show that a prior art reference teaches each and every element in an anticipated claim. Independent claim 26 has been previously amended to direct towards a novel system for modifying a digital media playlist based on user request while complying with recognition of restrictive criteria. Claims 27 and 28 recite additional patentable subject matter regarding the nature of the restrictive criteria. For example, claim 28 further recites the restrictive criteria comprises compliance with a set of group criteria.

D4. The primary cited and applied reference, Dunning, discloses a mere passing mention of generating new playlists within limiting legislation so as to comply with the Digital Millennium Copyright Act (see page 4 [0049]), but makes absolutely no further mention of any restrictive criteria that may affect an existing

playlist. Certainly, Dunning does not rise to the level of disclosing such criteria as compliance with a set of group criteria or limiting broadcast of digital media so as that fewer than a substantial number of media items are delivered within an hour of when their corresponding request was received. In fact, Dunning provides no link between any requested media items and subjugation to any restrictive criteria. Dunning simply does not address the nature of dealing with digital media requests and actual adding the requested digital media to a playlist. At best, Dunning discloses adding one or more digital media items to populate a newly generated playlist based upon past user choices or user preferences and specifically not based on any current request from a user.

D5. In view of the foregoing, the Appellants respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 27-28 must fail for impropriety, and that Board must accordingly overturn these rejections.

IX. SUMMARY

Appellants submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early and favorable action allowing all of the pending claims and passing this application to issue is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
AXIOS LAW GROUP

Date: December 6, 2006

by: /Kevin D. Jablonski/  
Kevin D. Jablonski  
Reg. No.: 50,401

Axios Law Group  
1725 Westlake Avenue N, Suite 150  
Seattle, WA 98109  
Telephone: 206-217-2224

X. CLAIMS APPENDIX A

1. (Previously Pending) A computer implemented method of delivering digital media items to one or more user electronic devices, the method comprising:

delivering to one or more of the user electronic devices, via a computer network, the digital media items in a sequential order from a playlist, the playlist indicating a plurality of the digital media items to be delivered and the sequential order for their delivery to one or more of the user electronic devices;

receiving one or more requests for at least one digital media item from one or more of the user electronic devices; and

selectively adding an indication of the requested digital media item to the playlist on at least one of the user electronic devices if the modified playlist would satisfy a set of restrictive criteria.

2. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the set of restrictive criteria comprises whether the playlist satisfies a set of group preferences.

3. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the adding comprises inserting a requested media item at a random position in the playlist.

4. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the adding comprises:

attempting to add the requested media item to a position in the playlist so that the modified playlist satisfies the set of restrictive criteria; and

disregarding the request if the requested media item cannot be added to the playlist so that the modified playlist would satisfy the set of restrictive criteria.

5. (Original) The method of claim 4, wherein the set of restrictive criteria comprises whether the playlist complies with the Digital Millennium Copyright Act requirement for obtaining a statutory license.

6. (Previously Pending) The method of claim 1, wherein the delivering media items comprises broadcasting media items to one or more of the user electronic devices so

that fewer than a substantial number of media items are delivered within an hour of when their corresponding request was received.

7. (Previously Pending) The method of claim 6, wherein the delivering media items further comprises broadcasting media items to one or more of the user electronic devices so that fewer than a substantial number of media items are delivered at a time that at least one of the user electronic devices who made the request is informed the requested media items will be delivered.

8. (Previously Pending) The method of claim 1, wherein the delivering media items comprises broadcasting media items to one or more of the user electronic devices so that the media items are delivered in compliance with the Digital Millennium Copyright Act requirement for obtaining a statutory license.

9. (Previously Pending) The method of claim 1, further comprising:  
providing a searchable database of media items that allows at least one of the user electronic devices to search the database by a set of media attributes;  
receiving a request from one or more of the user electronic devices for a media item from the database; and  
selectively adding the requested media item from the database to the playlist if the modified playlist would satisfy the set of restrictive criteria.

10. (Previously Pending) The method of claim 1, wherein the adding comprises limiting the number of requests from at least one of the user electronic devices.

11. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the media items are sound recordings.

26. (Previously Pending) One or more media servers for delivering digital media files to a plurality of client electronic devices over a computer network, the one or more media servers comprising:

a network connection for communicatively coupling one or more of the media servers with the plurality of client electronic devices over the network;



a playlist memory containing a playlist, wherein the playlist indicates a sequential order to render a set of the digital media files;

a media storage memory containing a library of the digital media files; and

a processor coupled with the network connection, the playlist memory, and the media storage memory, the processor operative to:

evaluate requests for digital media files from one or more of the client electronic devices using a set of restrictive criteria;

upon at least one of the requests satisfying the set of restrictive criteria, add an indication of the requested digital media file to the playlist; and

transmit digital media files according to the sequential order indicated by the playlist from the media storage memory to the plurality of client electronic devices over the computer network.

27. (Previously Pending) The one or more media servers of claim 26, wherein the one or more media servers broadcast fewer than a substantial number of digital media files within an hour of receiving the request for a corresponding digital media file, or at a time that at one client electronic device is informed that the requested digital media file will be broadcast.

28. (Previously Pending) The one or more media servers of claim 26, wherein the set of restrictive criteria comprise whether the playlist satisfies a set of group preferences.

29. (Previously Pending) The one or more media servers of claim 26, wherein the digital media files are digital sound files.

30. (Previously Pending) The one or more media servers of claim 26, wherein:  
the playlist memory contains a plurality of playlists, each playlist corresponding to a network media channel;

the processor is adapted to receive requests for digital media files from the plurality of client electronic devices, each request being associated with a network media channel, wherein the processor evaluates each request using one or more restrictive criteria and, if the playlist including the requested digital media file would

satisfy the set of restrictive criteria, adds the requested digital media file to the playlist; and

the one or more media servers broadcast digital media files sequentially to the network on each of the plurality of network media channels according to each corresponding playlist.

31. (Previously Pending) The one or more media servers of claim 30, wherein, for each network media channel, the one or more media servers broadcast fewer than a substantial number of digital media files within an hour of receiving at least one of the requests for the corresponding digital media file, or at a time that at least one of the client electronic devices is informed that the requested digital media file will be broadcast.

32. (Previously Pending) The one or more media servers of claim 30, wherein the set of restrictive criteria comprises a set of group preferences to each network media channel.

XI. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

NONE.

XII. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

NONE.